by me, for I am not so presumptuous as to indulge the hope that any thing I may say will deserve the attention which I have desired, but to listen to their own reason, their own judgment, their own good sense, in determining upon what is best to be done for our country in the actual posture in which we find her. Sir, to this great obect have my efforts been directed during this whole session. I have cut myself off from all the usual enjoyments of social life. I have confined myself almost entirely, with very cial life, I have confined myself almost entirely, with very few exceptions, to my own chamber, and from the beginning few exceptions, to my own chamber, and from the beginning of the session to the present time my thoughts have been anxiously directed to the object of finding some plan, of proposing some mode of accommodation, which should once more restore the blessings of concord, harmony, and peace to this great country. I am not vain enough to suppose that I have been successful in the accomplishment of this object, but I have presented a scheme, and allow me to say to honorable Senators that, if they find in that plan any thing that is defective, if they find in it any thing that is worthy of acceptance but is susceptible of improvement by amendment, it ance but is susceptible of improvement by amendment, it seems to me that the true and patriotic course is not to denounce it, but to improve it—not to reject without examination any project of accommodation having for its object the restoration of harmony in this country, but to look at it to see if it be susceptible of alteration or improvement, so as to accomplish the object which I indulge the hope is common to all and every one of us, to restore peace and quiet and harmony and hap-

one of us, to restore peace and quiet and harmony and happiness to this country.

Sir, when I came to consider this subject, there were two or three general purposes which it seemed to me to be most desirable, if possible, to accomplish. The one was, to settle all the controverted questions arising out of the subject of slavery. It seemed to me to be doing very little if we settled one question and left other distracting questions unadjusted. It seemed to me to be doing but little if we stopped one leak only in the ship of State, and left other leaks capable of producing danger, if not destruction, to the vessel. I therefore turned my attention to every subject connected with the institution of slavery, and out of which controverted questions had sprung, to see if it were possible or practicable to accommodate and adjust the whole of them. Another principal object which attracted my attention was, to endeavor to form et which attracted my attention was, to endeavor to form the ancheme of accommodation as that neither of the two assess of States into which our country is so unhappily divided

classes of States into which our country is so unhappity divided should make any sacrifice of any great principle. I believe, sir, the series of resolutions which I have had the honor to present to the Senate accomplishes that object.

Sir, another purpose which I had in view was this: I was aware of the difference of opinion prevailing between these two classes of States. I was aware that, whilst one portion of the Union was pushing matters, as it seemed to me, to the greatest extremity, another portion of the Union was pushing them to an opposite, and perhaps not less dangerous extremity. It appeared to me, then, that if any arrangement, any satisfactory adjustment could be made of the controverted questions between the two classes of States, that adjustment, that arrangement, could only be successful and effectual by exacting from both parties some concessions—not of principle, not of principle at all, but of feeling, of opinion, in relation to matters in controversy between them. Sir, I believe the resolutions which I have prepared fulfil that object. I believe, sir, that you will find, upon that careful, rational, and attentive examination of them which I think they deserve, that neither party in some of them make any concession at all; in others the concessions of forbearance are mutual; and, in the third place, in reference to the slaveholding States, there are resolutions making concessions to them by the opposite class third place, in reference to the slaveholding States, there are resolutions making concessions to them by the opposite class of States, without any compensation whatever being rendered by them to the non-slaveholding States. I think every one of these characteristics which I have assigned, and the measures which I proposed, is susceptible of clear and satisfactory demonstration by an attentive perusal and critical examination of the resolutions themselves. Let us take up the first resolutions

The first resolution, Mr. President, as you are aware, re lates to California, and it declares that California, with suitable limits, ought to be admitted as a member of this Union, without the imposition of any restriction either to interdict or to introduce slavery within her limits. Well, now, is there any concession in this resolution by either party to the other? I know that gentlemen who come from slaveholding States say the North gets all that it desires; but by whom does it get it? Does it get it by any action of Congress? If slavery be interdicted within the limits of California, has it been done by Congress—by this Government? No, sir. That interdiction is imposed by California herself. And has it not been the doctrine of all parties that when a State is about to be admitted into the Union, the State has a right to decide for itself whe-

[Here the confusion arising from the pressure of the crowd was so great that it was with difficulty Mr. C. could be heard. And he suspended his remarks until the lobbies had been sufficiently cleared to secure a restoration of order.]

Mr. CLAY resumed. The great principle, sir, which was in contest upon the memorable occasion of the introduction of Missouri into the Union was, whether it was competent or of Missouri into the Union was, whether it was competent or not competent for Congress to impose any restriction which should exist after she became a member of the Union? We who were in favor of the admission of Missouri contended that no such restriction should be imposed. We contended that, whenever she was once admitted into the Union, she had all the rights and privileges of any pre-existing State in the Union, and that among these rights and privileges one was to ther slavery should or should not exist within her limits; that she had as much a right to decide upon the introduction of slavery or its abolition as New York had a right to decide upon the introduction or abolition of slavery; and that, although subsequently admitted, she stood amongst her peers equally invested with all the privileges that any one of the original thirteen States, had a right to enjoy. And so, sir, I think that those who have been contending with so much earnestness and perseverance for the Wilmot proviso ought to reflect that, even if they could carry their object and adopt the proviso, it ceases the moment any State or Territory to which it was applicable came to be admitted as a member of the Union. Why, sir, no one contends now, no one believes that with regard to those Northwestern States to which the ordinance of 1787 applied—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan—no one can now believe but that any one of those States, if they thought proper to do it, have just as much right to introduce slavery within their borders as Virginia has to maintain the existence of slavery within hers. Then, sir, if in the struggle for power and empire between the two classes of States a decision in California has taken place adverse to the wishes of the Southern States, it is a decision not made by the General Government. It is a decision respecting which they can utter no complaint towards the General Government. It is a decision made by California herself; which California had unquestionably the right to make under the constitution of the United States. There is, then, made some time ago, a case where neither party concedes; where the question of slavery, neither its introduction nor interdiction, is decided in reference to the action of this Government; and if it has been decided, it has been by a different body—by a different power—by California itself, who had a right to make the decision.

Mr. Practicant

Mr. President, the next resolution in the series which Mr. President, the next resolution in the series which I have offered I beg gentlemen candidly now to look at. I was aware, perfectly aware of the perseverance with which the Wilmot proviso was insisted upon. I know that every one of the free States in this Union, without exception, had by its legislative body passed resolutions instructing their Senators and requesting their Representatives to get that restriction incorporated in any territorial government which might be established under the auspices of Congress. I knew how much, and I regretted how much, the free States had put their hearts upon the adoption of this measure. In the setheir hearts upon the adoption of this measure. In the se-cond resolution I call upon them to waive persisting in it. cond resolution I call upon them to waive persisting in it. I ask them, for the sake of peace and in the spirit of mutual forbearance to other members of the Union, to give it up—to no longer insist upon it—to see, as they must see, if their eyes are open, the dangers which lie ahead, if they persevere in ineisting upon it. When I called upon them in this resolution to do this, was I not bound to offer, for a surrender of that favorite principle or measure of theirs, some compensa-tion, not as an equivalent by any means, but some com-pensation in the spirit of mutual forbearance, which animating one side, ought at the same time to actuate the other side. Well, sir, what is it that is offered them? It is a declaration of what I characterized, and must still characterize, with great deference to all those who entertain opposite opinions, as two truths, I will not say incontestable, but to me clear, and I think they ought to be regarded as indisputable truths. What are they? The first is, that by law putable truths. What are they? The first is, that by law slavery no longer exists in any part of the acquisitions made by us from the Republic of Mexico; and the other is, that in our opinion, according to the probabilities of the case, slavery never will be introduced into any portion of the territories so acquired from Mexico. Now, I have heard it said that this declaration of what I call these two truths is equivalent to the enactment of the Wilmot proviso. I have heard this asserted, but is that the case? If the Wilmot proviso be adopted in Territorial Governments established over these countries acquired from Mexico, it would be a positive enactment, a prohibition, an interdiction as to the interduction of always within them, but with a second countries of always within them. a positive enactment, a promotion, an interdiction as to the introduction of slavery within them; but with regard to these opinions I had hoped, and I shall still indulge the hope, that these who represent the free States will be inclined not to insist—indeed it would be extremely difficult to give to these declarations the form of positive enactment. I had hoped that they would be satisfied with the simple expression of the opinion of Congress, leaving it upon the basis of that opinion, without asking for what seems to me almost imprac-ticabl, if not impossible—for any subsequent enactment to be introduced into the bill by which Territorial Governments should be established. And I can only say that the second resolution, even without the declaration of these two truths expressed, would be much more acceptable to me than with them.; but I could not forget that I was proposing a scheme of arrangement and compromise, and I could not, therefore, depart from the duty, which the preparation of such a scheme seems to me to impose, of offer-ing, whilst we ask the surrender on one side of a favorite measure, of offering to the other side some compensation for that

of Mexico, at the moment of the cession of these countries to us by the treaty in question. With what patients would excellent a specific from slaveholding States tience would gentlemen coming from slaveholding States listen to any argument which should be urged by the free States, that, notwithstanding the existence of slavery within those territories, the constitution of the United States abolished it the moment it operated upon and took effect in the ceded territory? Well, is there not just as much ground to contend that, where a moiety of the States is free and the other moiety is slaveholding, the principle of freedom which prevails in the one class shall operate as much as the principle of slavery which prevails in the other? Can you come, amidst this conflict of interests, principles, and legisla come, amidst this conflict of interests, principles, and legisla lation which prevails in the two parts of the Union, to any other conclusion than that which I understand to be the conother conclusion than that which I understand to be the con-clusion of the public law of the world, of reason, and justice: that the status of law, as it existed at the moment of the conquest or the acquisition, remains until it is altered by the sovereign authority of the conquering or acquiring power? That is the great principle which you can scarcely turn over a page of public law of the world without finding recognised and every where established. The laws of Mexico, as they existed at the moment of the cession of the ceded territories to this country, remained the laws until, and unless, they were to this country, remained the laws until, and unless, they were altered by that new sovereign power which this people and these territories come under in consequence of the treaty of cession to the United States.

I think then, Mr. President, that, without trespassing fur-

ther, or exhausting the little stock of strength which I have, and for which I shall have abundant use in the progress of the argument, I may leave that part of the subject, with two or three observations only upon the general power which I think appertains to this Government on the subject of

slavery.

Sir, before I approach that subject, allow me to say that, in my humble judgment, the institution of slavery presents two questions totally distinct, and resting on entirely different grounds—slavery within the States, and slavery without the grounds—slavery within the States, and slavery without the States. Congress, the General Government, has no power, under the Constitution of the United States, to touch slavery within the States, except in the three specified particulars in that instrument: to adjust the subject of representation; to impose taxes when a system of direct taxation is made; and to perform the duty of surrendering, or causing to be delivered impose taxes when a system of direct taxation is made; and to perform the duty of surrendering, or causing to be delivered up, fugitive slaves that may escape from service which they owe in slave States, and take refuge in free States. And, sir, I am ready to say, that if Congress were to attack, within the States, the institution of slavery, for the purpose of the overthrow or extinction of slavery, that then, Mr. President, my voice would be for war; then would be made a case which would justify, in the sight of God and in the presence of the nations of the earth, resistance, on the part of the slave States to such an unconstitutional and usurped attempt as would be made on the supposition which I have stated. Then we should be acting in defence of our rights, our domicils, our property, our safety, our lives; and then, I think, would be furnished a case in which the slaveholding States would be justified, by all considerations which pertain to the happiness and security of man, to employ every instrument which God or nature had placed in their hands to resist such an attempt on the part of the free States. And then, if unfortunately civil war should break out, and we should present to the nations of the earth the spectacle of one portion of sent to the nations of the earth the spectacle of one portion of this Union endeavoring to subvert an institution in violation of the constitution and the most sacred obligations which can of the constitution and the most sacred obligations which can bind men; we should present the spectacle in which we should have the sympathies, the good wishes, and the desire for our success by all men who love justice and truth. Far different, I fear, would be our case—if unhappily we should be plunged into civil war—if the two parts of this coun-try should be placed in a position hostile toward each other in order to carry slavery into the new territories acquired from Mexico.

Mr. President, we have heard, all of us have read of the Mr. President, we have heard, all of us have read of the efforts of France to propagate—what, on the continent of Europe? Not slavery, sir; not slavery, but the rights of man; and we know the fate of her efforts in a work of that kind. But if the two portions of this Confederacy should unhappily be involved in civil war, in which the effort on the one side would be to restrain the introduction of slavery into new territories, and on the other side to force its introinto new territories, and on the other side to force its introduction there, what a spectacle should we present to the contemplation of astonished mankind. An effort not to propagate right, but I must say—though I trust it will be understood to be said with no desire to excite feeling—an effort to propagate wrong in the territories thus acquired from Merico? It would be a war in which we should have no sympathy, no good wishes, and in which all mankind would be against us, and in which our own history itself would be against us; for, from the commencement of the revolution down to the present time, we have constantly reproached our British ancestors for the introduction of slavery into this coun-British ancestors for the introduction of slavery into this country; and allow me to say that, in my opinion, it is one of the best def nees which can be made to preserve the institution in this country, that it was forced up on us against the wishes

sume no one will controvert, in Mexico prior to the cession of these territories. Mexico could have abolished slavery or introduced slavery either in California or New Mexico. That must be conceded. Who will controvert this position? Well, Mexico has parted from the territory and from the sovereignty ver the territory ; and to whom did she transfer it ? She trans ferred the territory and the sovereignty of the territory to the Government of the United States. The Government of the United States, then, acquires in sovereignty and in territory over California and New Mexico, all, either in sovereignty or territory, that Mexico held in California or New Mexico, by the ssion of those territories. Sir, dispute that who can. The power exists or it does not; no one will contend for its annihila-tion. It existed in Mexico. No one, I think, can deny that. tion. It existed in Mexico. No one, I think, can deny that. Mexico alienates the sovereignty over the territory, and her alience is the Government of the United States. The Government of the United States, then, possesses all power which Mexico possessed over the ceded Territories, and the Government of the United States can do in reference to them—within, I admit, certain limits of the constitution—whatever Mexico could have done. There are prohibitions upon the power of Congress within the constitution, which prohibitions, I admit, must apply to Congress whenever she legislates, whether for the old States or for new Territories; but, within those prohibitions, the powers of the United States over the ceded territories are co-extensive and equal to the powers of Mexico in the ceded territories prior to the cession.

Sir, in regard to this treaty-making power, all who have any occasion to examine into its character and to the possible

Congress within the constitution, which prohibitions, I admit, must apply to Congress whenever she legislates, whether for the old States or for new Territories; but, within those prohibitions, the powers of the United States over the ceded territories are co-extensive and equal to the powers of Mexico in the ceded territories prior to the cession.

Sir, in regard to this treaty-making power, all who have any occasion to examine into its character and to the possible extent to which it may be carried, know that it is a power unlimited in its nature, except in so far as any limitation may be found in the Constitution of the United States; and upon this subject there is no limitation which prescribes the extent to which the powers should be exercised. I know, sir, it is argued that there is no grant of power in the constitution in specific terms over the subject of slavery any where; and there is no gamnt in the constitution to Congress specifically over the subject of a vast variety of matters upon which the powers of Congress may unquestionably operate. The major includes the minor. The general grant of power compressions of the only place where this class composes a majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] have majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] have majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] have majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] have majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] have majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] have majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] have majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] have majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] have majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] have majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] have majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] have majority of the whole population of the country. [Laughter.] have ma this subject there is no limitation which prescribes the extent to which the powers should be exercised. I know, sir, it is argued that there is no grant of power in the constitution in specific terms over the subject of slavery any where; and there is no grant in the constitution to Congress specifically over the subject of a vast variety of matters upon which the powers of Congress may unquestionably operate. The major includes the minor. The general grant of power comprehends all the particulars and elements of which that power consists. The power of acquisition by treaty draws after it the power of government of the country acquired. If there be a power to acquire, there must be, to use the language of the tribunal that sits below, a power to govern. I think, therefore, sir, without, at least for the present, dwelling further on this part of thesubject, that to the two sources of authority in Congress to which I have referred, and especially to the last, may be traced the power of Congress to act in the territories in question; and, sir, I go to the extent, and I think it is a power in Congress equal to the introduction or exclusion of

but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, equally conclusive in my mind as that which relates to the territories, and that is the treaty-making power—the acquiring power. Now, I put it to gentlemen, is there not at this moment a power somewhere existing either to admit or exclude slavery from the ceded territory? It is not an annihilated power. That is impossible. It is a subsisting, actual existing power; and where does it exist? It existed, I presults of the salvery question, with all its troubles and difficulties, is added,

meeting us at every step we take.

There is, sir, a third question, also, adding to the difficulty. By the resolution of annexation slavery was interdicted in all north of 36° 30′; but of New Mexico, that portion of it which lies north of 36° 30′ embraces, I think, about one-third of the whole of New Mexico east of the Rio Grande; so that you the whole of New Mexico east of the Rio Grande; so that you have free and slave territory mixed, boundary and slavery mixed together, and all these difficulties are to be encountered. And allow me to say, sir, that among the considerations which induce me to think that it was necessary to settle all these questions, was the state of things that now exists in New Mexico, and the state of things to be apprehended both there and in other portions of the Territories. Why, sir, at this moment—and I think I shall have the concurrence of the two Senators from that State when I announce the fact—at this moment there is a feeling approximation to abburrance on the moment there is a feeling approximating to abhorrence on the part of the people of New Mexico at the idea of any union with Texas.

with Texas.

Mr. RUSK. Only, sir, on the part of the office-seekers and army followers who have settled there, and attempted to mislead the people.

Mr. CLAY. Ah! Sir, that may be, and I am afraid that

one two or three nundred persons from New Lingand.
Cincinnati, I believe, was the next point where a settlement of the soil, until those settlement of the soil and proper that Congress, who owns the soil that is settlement of the soil, until those settlement of the soil, until those settlement of the soil and proper that congress, who owns the soil that is settlement of the soil, soil there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, but I said there is another source of power equally satisfact

member of the great American family. But here the power is. Possibly, sir, upon that question—however I offer no positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix it in a way unjust in the opinion of Texas, and contrary to her rights, she might bring the question before the Supreme Court of the United States, and have it there again investigated and decided. I say possibly, sir, because I am not one of that class of politicians who believe that every question is a competent and proper question for the Supreme Court of the United States. There are questions too large for any tribunal of that kind to try; great political questions, national territorial questions, which transcend their limits; for such questions their powers are utterly incompetent. Whether this be one of those questions or not, I shall not decide; but I will maintain that the United States are now invested solely and exclusively with that power which was common to both nations—to fix, ascertain, and settle the western and northern tions-to fix, ascertain, and settle the western and norther

limits of Texas.

Sir, the other day my honorable friend who represents well the State of Texas, said that we had no more right to touch the limits of Texas than we had to touch the limits of Kentucky. I think that was the illustration he gave us-the a State is one and indivisible, and that the General Government has no right to sever it. I sgree with him, sir, in that; where the limits are ascertained and certain, where they are undisputed and indisputable. The General Government has no right, nor has any other earthly power the right, to interfere with the limits of a State whose boundaries are thus fixed thus according to the second of the second o fere with the limits of a state whose boundaries are thus fixed, thus ascertained, known, and recognised. The whole power, at least, to interfere with it is voluntary. The extreme case may be put—one which I trust in God may never happen in this nation—of a conquered nation, and of a constitution adapting itself to the state of subjugation or conquest to which it has been reduced; and giving up whole States, as well as parts of States, in order to save from the covenience. which it has been reduced; and giving up whole States, as well as parts of States, in order to save from the conquering arms of the invader what remains. I say such a power in case of extremity may exist. But I admit that, short of such extremity, voluntarily, the General Government has no right to separate a State—to take a portion of its territory from it, or to regard it otherwise than as integral, one and indivisible, and not to be affected by any legislation of ours. But, then, I assume, what does not exist in the case of Texas, that these boundaries must be known, accertained, and indisputable. With regard to Texas, all was open, all was unfixed; all is unfixed at this moment, with respect to her limits west and north of the Nueces.

But, sir, we gave fifteen millions of dollars for this territory that we bought, and God knows what a cos'ly bargain

be a power of sequinit on by teasy draw after it, and the power of sequent in the second of the seco

The state of the s have fixed upon any western limit for Texas, and did not do it, and if the United States have acquired to themselves or acquired by the treaty in question, all the territory upon which the western limit must have been fixed, when it was fixed, it seems to me that no one can resist the logical conclusion that the United States now have themselves a power to do what the United States and Mexico conjointly could have done.

Sir. I admit it is a delicate power—an extremely delicate the large grant of money that we propose to make, and our liberality in expersing her from a portion of make, and our liberality in expersing her from a portion of make. clusion that the United States and Mexico conjounty to do what the United States and Mexico conjounty to do what the United States and Mexico conjounty to do what the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly in the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly in the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly in the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly in the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly in the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly in the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly in the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly in the United States were to fix the positive opinion—possibly in the United States were to fix the po

I have now got through with what I had to say in reference to this resolution, and if the Senator from Mississippi wishes it, I will give way for a motion for adjournment.

On motion of Mr. FOOTE the further consideration of the resolutions was postponed until to morrow; and, on motion,
The Senate adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1850. The Senate being about to proceed to the consideration of the special order, being the resolutions submitted by (Mr. CLAY, of Kentucky—
Mr. MANGUM. I move, sir, that the indulgence which

Mr. MANGUM. I move, sir, that the indulgence which was granted to the audience yesterday, during the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky, be extended to the ladies by a temporary suspension of the rules to day. A young and gallant body like this, I suppose, will be ready to accord this privilege at once. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOUSTON. I second the motion. It was my intention, if the Senator from North Carolina had not anticipated me, to have made the motion myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is moved that the rules of the Senate be suspended, so as to admit the ladies from the lobbies to the floor. It is one which requires unanimous consent for its adoption.

sent for its adoption.

Mr. FOOTE. A single remark, Mr. President. This Mr. FOOTE. A single remark, Mr. Fresident. This motion addresses itself to not only the gallantry of the body, but to its sense of justice. The ladies were admitted yesterday, and participated in the intellectual banquet then spread for us. They were all dismissed before the feast closed, and I insist upon it that, in sheer justice, they should be admitted to hear the continuation of the speech of the Senator from Kantualta.

I insist upon it that, in sheer justice, they should be admitted to hear the continuation of the speech of the Senator from Kentucky.

The VICE PRESEDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the motion will be considered as adopted.

[Ladies were accordingly admitted to the privileged seats, and to ladies the circular gallery was exclusively devoted.]

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, if there be in this vast assemblege of beauty, grace, elegancs, and intelligence, any who have come here under an expectation that the humble individual who now addresses you means to attempt any display, any use of ambitious language, any extraordinary ornament or decoration of speech, they will be utterly disappointed. The season of the year, and my own season of life, both admonish me to abstain from the use of any such ornaments; but above all, Mr. President, the awful subject upon which it is my duty to address the Senate and the country forbids my saying any thing but what pertains strictly to that subject; and my sole desire is to make myself, in seriousness, soberness, and plainness, understood by you and by those who think proper to listen to me.

When, yesterday, the adjournment of the Senate took place, at that stage of the discussion of the resolutions which I had submitted which related to Texas and her boundary, I thought I had concluded the whole subject; but I was reminded by a friend that perhaps I was not sufficiently explicit on a single point, and that is, the relation of Texas and the Government of the United States. Sir, it was said that perhaps it might be understood, in regard to the proposed grant of three millions, or whatever may be the sum when ascertained, to Texas for which I think a responsibility exists on the part of the consideration of the surrender of her title to New Mexico this side of the Rio Grande, that we merely discharged an obligation which existed upon the Government of the United States in consequence of the appropriation of the debt of Texas. On the contrary, by an express stipulation in the re